

REMARKS

Claims 1-14, 16-22, and 24-31 were pending and rejected. Claims 1, 9, 19, and 27-31 have been amended, without prejudice to pursue the original claims in a related application. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §112

In the Action, claims 27-31 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. In response, these claims have been amended to overcome the rejections under 35 USC §112. Thus, reconsideration of these claims is respectfully requested with express withdrawal of the rejections 35 USC §112.

Claim Rejections

In the Action, claims 1-4, 6-8, and 26 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated over Hong (US 2004-0066481).

The remaining claims 5, 9-14, 16-22, 24-25, and 27-31 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over some combination of Hong, Kubota (JP 10-098190), Nishida (US 2002-0159016), and Kubo (US 6,091,467).

In response, Applicant asserts that these references, alone or in any combination, fail to disclose or even suggest each and every limitation of the present claims.

For example, present independent claim 1, as amended, recites the following limitations (*emphasis added*):

a shielding electrode formed on the passivation layer and disposed on a region between the source electrode and the drain electrode,
wherein the shielding electrode overlaps the gate electrode,
wherein the shielding electrode provides voltage shielding for the region on which it is disposed, and
wherein the shielding electrode comprises a transparent electrode.

In par. 51 and Fig. 4E, Hong explicitly discloses that second common electrode 224 is patterned to form an "H" shape overlapping first common electrodes 206 and pixel electrodes 207. As shown in Fig. 4E, second common electrode 224 is not positioned to overlap gate electrode 201a, and the second common electrode 224 is not positioned

between source electrode 202a and drain electrode 202b. Accordingly, Hong fails to disclose or even suggest that second common electrode 224 is disposed to overlap gate electrode 201a, as recited in present claim 1. Hong also fails to disclose or even suggest that second common electrode 224 is disposed on a region between source electrode 202a and drain electrode 202b, as recited in present claim 1.

Moreover, in par. 51, Hong explicitly discloses that second common electrode 224 shields pixel electrodes 207 from the affects of data voltage. Accordingly, Hong fails to disclose or even suggest that second common electrode 224 provides voltage shielding for the region between source electrode 202a and drain electrode 202b, as recited in present independent claim 1.

In sharp contrast to Hong, present independent claim 1, as amended, recites, “a shielding electrode formed on the passivation layer and disposed on a region between the source electrode and the drain electrode,” and, “wherein the shielding electrode overlaps the gate electrode,” and, “wherein the shielding electrode provides voltage shielding for the region on which it is disposed,” and, “wherein the shielding electrode comprises a transparent electrode.” Support for these limitations may be found throughout Applicants’ specification, e.g., Figs. 4-5 and pars. 72-119.

In one aspect, referring to Figs. 4-5, shielding electrode 196a is disposed at the same layer as the pixel electrode, and shielding electrode 196a is disposed in channels of the transistors, i.e., between source electrode 173a and drain electrode 175a. In another aspect, efficiencies of the thin film transistors may be improved because a voltage, e.g., lower than a common voltage, may be applied to the shielding electrode.

Moreover, the ancillary Nishida, Kubota, and Kubo references fail to remedy the deficiencies of Hong.

Therefore, since the cited Hong reference fails to disclose or even suggest each and every limitation of present independent claim 1, and the ancillary references fail to remedy the deficiencies of Hong, present independent claim 1, as amended, and any claims dependent thereon are considered to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectively requested.


Present independent claims 9, 19, and 27 have been amended in a similar manner as with present claim 1. Hence, for at least the same reasons as discussed above in reference to present claim 1, present independent claims 9, 19, and 27, as amended, including any claims respectively dependent thereon are considered to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectively requested.

CONCLUSION


For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested and a timely Notice of Allowance is solicited.

Fee Authorization: Although it is believed that no fee is due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. **08-1394**.

If there are any questions regarding any aspect of the application, please call the undersigned at (949) 752-7040.

Certificate of Transmission	
Certificate of Transmission: I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) via the USPTO's electronic filing system on the date below.	
<u>Electronically Filed by:</u>	
 Annie McNally	Dated: <u>August 17, 2009</u>

Respectfully submitted,


Jeffrey A. Hopkins
Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 53,034
Customer No. 27,683